



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,255	09/30/2003	Sachin Kukreja	MS#158496.02 (4964.1)	4042

38779 7590 03/09/2007

SENNIGER POWERS (MSFT)
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/09/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on September 30, 2003. Claims 1-45 are pending. At this time, claims 1-45 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on September 30, 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 1-45 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-3 and 5-45 of copending Application No. 10/044,565. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

The two inventions claiming for:

i. an application programming interface (API) for communication between an administration server and an authentication server connected via a data communication network, said administration server providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the users of the namespace service, said administration server being responsive to an administrator for issuing at least one request to said authentication server, said request specifying at least one action to be performed in relation to the namespace;

ii. A method for delegating at least one administrative task from a first system to a second system, said first and second systems connected via a data communication network, said second system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network.

Art Unit: 2135

iii. One or more computer readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method above.

iv. A computer readable medium having computer-executable components for delegating at least one administrative task from an authentication system to at least one administration system, said authentication system and administration system connected via a data communication network, said administration system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network.

v. A system for authenticating at least one user of a namespace service

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 23, 35, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

a. *Referring to claims 23, 35, and 36-38:*

Claims 23, 35, and 36-38 recite "a medium containing a computer-readable set of instructions and a computer readable medium having computer-executable components." These claims are clearly a software program and it is non-statutory as not being tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Furthermore, applicant has pointed out in the specification (see page 14) "**The computer 130 may also include other removable/non-removable, volatile/nonvolatile computer storage media. For example, FIG. 2 illustrates a hard disk drive 154 that reads from or writes to non-removable, nonvolatile magnetic**

Art Unit: 2135

media. FIG. 2 also shows a magnetic disk drive 156 that reads from or writes to a removable, nonvolatile magnetic disk 158, and an optical disk drive 160 that reads from or writes to a removable, nonvolatile optical disk 162 such as a CD-ROM or other optical media", which clearly including intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed. Therefore, claims 23, 35, and 36-38 recite a non-statutory subject matter.

b. Referring to claims 18:

Claim 18 recites the language "permitting the respective user to contest an evicted account." Recognize that the claim requires is that a reference does not prohibit a computer from doing the recited acts. They do not cause any functionality to occur in the computer. Absent recitation of any code or steps for causing a computer to do anything, instead just ensuring there's no code or steps which prohibit it, there does not appear to be a useful, concrete and tangible result. Therefore, claim 18 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Recognize that all these claims require is that a reference does not prohibit a computer from doing the recited acts. They do not cause any functionality to occur in the computer. It is unclear what Applicant's intended metes and bounds of the claim are, since the claim appears to cover anything and everything that does not prohibit actions from occurring. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2135

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carter et al (US 6,742,114 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Carter teaches an application programming interface (API) for communication between an administration server and an authentication server connected via a data communication network, said administration server providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the users of the namespace service, said administration server being responsive to an administrator for issuing at least one request to said authentication server, said request specifying at least one action to be performed in relation to the namespace, said API comprising instructions for:

(1) receiving, by the authentication server, the request from the administration serve (**column 3, lines 30-35 of Carter**);

(2) verifying, by the authentication server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server (column 3, lines 40-45 of Carter); and

(3) performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request (**column 4, lines 15-20 of Carter**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein the database associated with the authentication server stores authorization information relating to the administration server and wherein verifying the authority of the administration server to issue the request comprises identifying the administration server and locating corresponding authorization information for the administration server in the database associated with the authentication server **(column 8, lines 35-40 of Carter)**.

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator **(column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter)**.

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator **(column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter)**.

e. Referring to claim 24:

i. Carter teaches a method for delegating at least one administrative task from a first system to a second system, said first and second systems connected via a data communication network, said second system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said method comprising:

(1) maintaining a database of one or more namespaces including the namespace associated with the second system, said database being maintained by the first system **(column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter)**;

(2) receiving a call from the second system by the first system, said call providing a request that at least one routine be performed to implement a desired administrative task for managing the database **(column 3, lines 30-35 of Carter)**; and

Art Unit: 2135

(3) executing the routine, by the first system, in response to the call received from the second system to implement the administrative task **(column 4, lines 15-20 of Carter)**.

f. Referring to claim 35:

i. This claim consists one or more computer readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 24, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 24 above.

g. Referring to claim 36:

i. This claim consists a computer readable medium having computer-executable components for delegating at least one administrative task from an authentication system to at least one administration system, said authentication system and administration system connected via a data communication network, said administration system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 24 above.

h. Referring to claim 39:

i. This claim consists a system for authenticating at least one user of a namespace service to implement the method claims 1-4, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-4 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 1-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US Publication 2002/0165960 A1), and further in view of Carter et al (US 6,742,114 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Chen teaches an application programming interface (API) for communication between an administration server and an authentication server connected via a data communication network, said administration server providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the users of the namespace service, said administration server being responsive to an administrator for issuing at least one request to said authentication server, said request specifying at least one action to be performed in relation to the namespace, said API comprising instructions for:

(1) receiving, by the authentication server, the request from the administration serve (**see Figure 38 and paragraph 0223 of Chan**).

ii. Although Chan teaches the operation of authentication server and the functionality of authentication process, Chan is silent on the capability of verifying and performing by the authentication server. On the other hand, Carter teaches;

(2) verifying, by the authentication server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server (**column 3, lines 40-45 of Carter**); and

(3) performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request (**column 4, lines 15-20 of Carter**).

iii. Chan and Carter are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding managing access to a related group of resources, such as resources in a domain or namespace (**paragraph 23 of Chan, and column 9, lines 45-50 of Carter**).

iv. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Carter regarding deputizing and delegating rights from one namespace into another into the system of Chan. The combination of Chan and Carter would have disclosed an administration server (**paragraph 0101 of Chan**) providing a service associated with a namespace (**column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 5-10 of Carter**). The combination of Chan and

Art Unit: 2135

Carter would have disclosed verifying, by the authentication server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server; **(column 3, lines 40-45 of Carter)** and performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request **(column 4, lines 15-20 of Carter)**.

v. The motivation for said combination would have been, as Carter suggests **(column 5, lines 1-5 of Carter)**, so that entities responsible for particular actions can be more readily identified.

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein the database associated with the authentication server stores authorization information relating to the administration server and wherein verifying the authority of the administration server to issue the request comprises identifying the administration server and locating corresponding authorization information for the administration server in the database associated with the authentication server **(column 8, lines 35-40 of Carter)**.

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator **(column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter)**.

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator **(column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter)**.

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises reserving the namespace to prevent an unauthorized user from obtaining an account in the namespace **(paragraph 0129 of Chan)**.

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein reserving the namespace comprises creating an administrator account associated with the administration server to manage the namespace (**paragraphs 0103-0104 of Chan**).

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises releasing the namespace to allow any user to obtain an account in the namespace. (**paragraph 0129 of Chan**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises maintaining and editing a namespace administrator list (**paragraphs 0103-0104 of Chan**).

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing a namespace administrator list comprises adding at least one administrator to the namespace administrator list (**paragraphs 0103-0104 of Chan**).

j. Referring to claim 10:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing a namespace administrator list comprises deleting at least one administrator from the namespace administrator list (**paragraphs 0103-0104 of Chan**).

k. Referring to claim 11:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises editing one or more user accounts in the namespace (**paragraph 0129 of Chan**).

l. Referring to claim 12:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises creating at least one user account in the namespace **(paragraphs 0260-0261 of Chan).**

m. Referring to claim 13:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises resetting a namespace password associated with at least one of the user accounts **(paragraphs 0260-0261 of Chan).**

n. Referring to claim 14:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises removing at least one of the user accounts from the namespace **(paragraphs 0260-0261 of Chan).**

o. Referring to claim 15:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises editing a profile associated with at least one of the user accounts **(paragraph 0260-0261 of Chan).**

p. Referring to claim 16:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises changing a sign-in name associated with at least one of the user accounts **(paragraphs 0260-0261 of Chan).**

q. Referring to claim 17:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises: listing user accounts associated with the namespace (paragraph 0134 of Chan); and evicting one or more of the user accounts from the namespace **(paragraphs 0260-0261 of Chan).**

r. Referring to claim 18:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action further comprises permitting the respective user to contest an evicted account (**paragraph 0256 of Chan**).

s. Referring to claim 19:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises auditing actions within user accounts associated with the namespace (**paragraph 0134 of Chan**).

t. Referring to claim 20:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) further comprising returning a success response from the authentication server to the administration server if the request was received, the administration server was verified, and the specified action was performed successfully (**paragraph 0142 of Chan**).

u. Referring to claim 21:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein performing the specified action comprises returning an error response from the authentication server to the administration server if the request was received, the administration server was not verified, or the specified action was performed unsuccessfully (**paragraph 0142 of Chan**).

v. Referring to claim 23:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein the instructions are computer-executable instructions stored on one or more computer readable media (**paragraph 0101 of Chan**).

w. Referring to claim 24:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches a

method for delegating at least one administrative task from a first system to a second

Art Unit: 2135

system, said first and second systems connected via a data communication network, said second system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said method comprising:

(1) maintaining a database of one or more namespaces including the namespace associated with the second system, said database being maintained by the first system (**column 8, lines 20-25 of Carter**);

(2) receiving a call from the second system by the first system, said call providing a request that at least one routine be performed to implement a desired administrative task for managing the database (**column 3, lines 30-35 of Carter**); and

(3) executing the routine, by the first system, in response to the call received from the second system to implement the administrative task (**column 4, lines 15-20 of Carter**).

x. Referring to claim 25:

i. The combination of Chan and Carter further teaches:

(1) wherein the routine comprises an application programming interface (API) for performing the administrative task (paragraphs 0269-0270 of Chan).

y. Referring to claims 27-41 and 43-45:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1-21 and 23-25, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-21 and 23-25 above.

12. Claims 22, 26, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US Publication 2002/0165960 A1), in view of Carter et al (US 6,742,114 B1), and further in view of James et al. (US 6,904,600).

a. Referring to claims 22, 26, and 42:

i. While the combination of Chan and Carter substantially disclosed the invention, the said combination is silent on the capability of using an API based on a simple object access protocol (SOAP). On the other hand,

Art Unit: 2135

Jones disclosed a method and system for providing an API to the Simple Object Access Protocol.

ii. Chan, Carter, and James are analogous art because they teach exchanging messages between elements in a distributed computing environment.

iii. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of James into the combined systems of Chan and Carter, in order to allow the API of Chan and Carter to communicate using SOAP. The combination of Chan, Carter, and James would have disclosed claims 22, 26, 42 wherein the API is based on a simple object access protocol (SOAP).

iv. The motivation for the said combination would have been, as James suggests (column 1, lines 45-50 of James), to enable application developers to focus on the unique aspects of their applications.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Davis et al (US 5, 867, 821) discloses a transport neutral technique allows an object manager to communicate with a CIM repository using any of a variety of protocols (see abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Application/Control Number: 10/675,255

Page 15

Art Unit: 2135

TBT

March 5, 2007

Change B.T. 7
AU2135